

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ALEJANDRA SOLANO, et al.,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE  
 DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:15-cv-01690-JCM-NJK

ORDER

It has come to the Court's attention that numerous documents (including the case-initiating documents) have been filed in this case with the full names of the minor children that Plaintiff is representing as guardian *ad litem*. In doing so, counsel have violated, *inter alia*, Rule 5.2(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Special Order No. 108, which require that only a minor's initials be provided. Accordingly, the Court hereby **INSTRUCTS** the Clerk's Office to change the docket in this case to remove the full names of the minors represented by Plaintiff as guardian *ad litem* and to replace those names with initials.

The Court further **STRIKES** and **SEALS** Docket Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12. For each document that they filed, counsel are **ORDERED** to file a properly redacted version that otherwise makes no changes to the document. The properly redacted documents shall be filed no later than November 25, 2015. Other than the pending motion to dismiss and stipulation for extension (Docket

Nos. 8, 12), those documents may be filed as attachments to a notice of compliance. The pending motion to dismiss and stipulation must be re-filed as standalone docket entries.<sup>1</sup>

The Court further **ORDERS** the parties to familiarize themselves with Rule 5.2 and Special Order No. 108, and to fully comply with them in the future. The Court expects strict compliance with the orders and rules of the Court, and the parties and counsel should be aware that the failure to comply may result in sanctions. *See, e.g., Davis v. Clark County Sch. Dist.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis 128937, \*5 n.3 (D. Nev. Sept. 9, 2013) (sanctioning counsel for repeated failure to comply with Court orders, including order to use only minor's initials in filings).<sup>2</sup>

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: November 20, 2015



---

NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Nothing herein shall be construed as altering the briefing schedule on the motion to dismiss. In particular, in the event that the refile of that motion triggers the issuance of an automatic notice of a response deadline through CM/ECF, counsel is instructed that the automatically noticed deadline is not controlling. *Cf. Carrillo v. B&J Andrews Enters., LLC*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis 22010, \*2 (D. Nev. Feb. 19, 2013).

<sup>2</sup> The Court has previously cautioned one of the attorneys improperly filing documents in this case on the very same issue. *See J.D.H. v. Las Vegas Metro. Police Dept.*, 2:13-cv-1300-APG-NJK, Docket No. 51 (August 14, 2014) (“Mr. Anderson and Mr. Hanseen are further **CAUTIONED** that they should expect future non-compliance with the Court’s redaction requirements to result in monetary sanctions.”).